

CANDOUR

*The British
Views - Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLIV Nos 8 & 9

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

August-September 1992

G.K.'s WEEKLY

EDITED BY *G.K. Chesterton*



Price 6d

WILL OWEN

THOSE GOEBBELS DIARIES!

The **Sunday Times** 'scoop' is reviewed by FRANK BROOKES

BY an act of gormandizing gymnastics the **Sunday Times** managed to get its cake and eat it too, though it almost choked on the crumbs! Scooping the rest of the press, courtesy of revisionist historian David Irving, the newspaper published extracts from what was alleged to be Goebbels' diaries discovered in some Moscow archives . . . but then it had to perform some impressive intellectual somersaults to prove that a) it was not intended to offend Jews, b) it did not really approve of David Irving, c) it did not even really trust him, d) it was far from supporting revisionists, and e) it was ready to throw in a two-page feature attacking and smearing revisionists and "neo-nazis" just to ensure the balance was right!

The diary extracts were interesting reading, but despite the fact that Irving had a **Sunday Times** minder hovering over his shoulder while he transcribed them (perhaps fearing in some curiously neurotic way that he would rewrite them), and notwithstanding "helpful interpretation" of the entries by court historian, Norman Stone, nothing emerged to worry revisionists. Even **Sunday Times** columnist Barbara Amiel, who is Jewish, acknowledged Irving's talent as an able and genuine researcher, opining that he "has a skill as an archivist of the Third Reich that has been recognised by historians". The fact that he was the only historian who could make sense of Goebbels' near-illegible scrawl, and thus give the newspaper the scoop it so badly wanted, was bitterly bewailed, particularly by the idle scholars who languish in their ivory and redbrick towers. "If only we could have used someone else," it was moaned. Perhaps, hoped Rabbi Dan Cohn-Sherbok, Irving's transcriptions would, paradoxically, refute the revisionist case forever. Unfortunately for some, they did not!

Nuremberg Indictment Not Substantiated

The revisionists' argument, as I see it, is that Hitler's Germany did not deliberately plan and carry out the systematic extermination of six million Jews by gassing them; that the German nation was not guilty for deliberately initiating the Second World War as Allied propagandists purported before, during and for nearly half a century after the infamous Nuremberg "war crimes" trials. Nothing in the Goebbels Diaries as published by the **Sunday Times** does anything to refute or even tangibly weaken this revisionist thesis. Not that Goebbels emerges as a candidate for canonisation. Few politicians would, especially if their war-time diaries were made public - and that includes men like Churchill and Stalin as well as Hitler and Goebbels.

Irving's **Churchill's War**, for instance, makes out a strong prima facie case for "good old Winnie" being corrupt, a coward and a drunkard! However, readers hoping to see revisionists routed by references confirming the gassing of Jews suffered disappointment. There were not any. In fact, the only 'bloodthirsty' passages refer to Goebbels' apparent delight at the burning of synagogues during Kristallnacht. And bad and sad though that is, it has to be read in the context of the assassination by a Jew of the German diplomat Ernst von Rath and the subsequent tide of fury the deed whipped up in Germany.

Situations leading up to war look different according to the point of

vantage. Much of what Hitler was doing in 1937-38 and 1939 in relation to Czechoslovakia and Poland was not startlingly revealed in the diaries. Anyone who has read Irving's **Hitler's War** would be familiar with the chain of events and circumstances. Who really was spoiling for a fight then is not crystal clear. Probably there were some Poles, Britons, Germans and Frenchmen working for peace while others were for war. Lurking in the background were more arcane interests who were definitely conspiring to manipulate events for their purpose of igniting a conflagration. Propaganda tricks were employed on both sides. Goebbels refers to Polish incidents affecting Germans which the **Sunday Times** interprets as being German dishonesty to make it look as if they were committed by Poles while being, in reality, an SS operation. There is no doubt, however, that some Polish attacks on German citizens did take place during that period since it is known that on occasion Hitler actually forbade the German press to report them lest negotiations then being held with Poland were put at risk.

Certainly there is a substantial amount in the Goebbels Diaries which shows the Propaganda Minister in tough and jubilant mood when it was a case of having to threaten Czechoslovakia. Again, however, this blustering behaviour must be seen against a background history of those grim days. German forces were not the only ones to march into that divided country. Our Polish allies swept in as well and, later, the Hungarians. It would be enlightening to read the diaries of Polish leaders involved in this carve-up.

Sunday Times Covers Its Back?

In the course of the **Sunday Times'** serialisation of the diaries, there were accompanying articles reassuring readers that the newspaper maintained a "politically correct" stance on Hitler, National Socialism and, now, the "neo-nazis". It does not seem to have impressed some readers. **The Independent** reported that "Jewish readers have boycotted the **Sunday Times** in large numbers because of the controversy". In Stanmore, north-west London, copies were only available from behind (not under?) the counter! More significantly, David Irving claimed in a **Guardian** interview that the **Sunday Times** suffered "horrendous pressure from the advertising industry" as a consequence of the Goebbels Diaries serialisation.

Nevertheless, two pages were devoted to the "chilling new fascist movement" now sweeping Europe. James Dalrymple reported his visit to Auschwitz and Birkenau in an article to be made available to schools in conjunction with the Holocaust Educational Trust. Dramatically written though the piece was, it did nothing to refute the revisionists. It dismissed them, of course. The Leuchter Report was written off as "absurd", while Fred Leuchter himself was insulted as "a strange little man". No mention was made of the fact that he is an authority on systems of execution. Was Dalrymple saying Leuchter is a liar?

Serialising part of the Goebbels Diaries provided the **Sunday Times** with a great opportunity for lashing out at revisionists. Such opportunity as the Editor granted David Irving, or any other expert revisionist, to reply to the charges levelled against them passed me by unnoticed! My fear is that rather than widening the debate about the Holocaust, the **Sunday Times** articles will prove to be the forerunner of a massive propaganda exercise to condition people into believing all the claims that six million were done to death at Auschwitz and other camps.

Indeed, on July 17th the **Jewish Chronicle** reported that a delegation from the Board of Deputies met the Home Secretary to discuss proposals to "toughen the race-hate laws, including the creation of a new offence of group defamation [which] would provide a new weapon with which to crack down on Holocaust revisionists".

As a Christian I am concerned with truth rather than propaganda. It is as a Christian that I believe whatever Goebbels wrote or the Nazis actually did (as distinct from being accused of doing) must be seen in the full context of what everyone else was doing at the time. The war undoubtedly happened. There was terrible loss of life and atrocities were committed on both sides. Many deaths occurred at Auschwitz and other camps, but so did many others at Dresden, Hamburg and other German cities. If it is right to accuse the Germans of creating a Holocaust, then it is justifiable to accuse Bomber Command of perpetrating another kind of Holocaust on behalf of the Allies, as any reader of Irving's **The Destruction of Dresden** will affirm.

One day, the full and dispassionate truth about events between 1939 and 1945 will be published. As a revisionist myself, I hope to see the day. Sadly for the **Sunday Times**, it will find that revisionists like David Irving, Arthur Butz, F.J.P. Veale and Harry Elmer Barnes scooped the truth years ago!

GOVERNED BY PIP-SQUEAKS

"IN a recent newspaper article berating those of us who believe we should not be part of the E.C., the Prime Minister wrote: 'We must not become a Little England, impoverished, derided, bereft of hope, languishing on the sidelines of history.' Setting aside the fact that he does not even understand the meaning of the term 'Little England', he needs a sharp reminder that we are a people of around 57 million with a superb history of achievement in all aspects of civilisation - invention, technology, commerce and, particularly, fortitude in adversity. We have stood alone. 'Come the four corners of the world in arms and we shall shock them,' growled the Conservative Prime Minister of the day. How the Conservative breed has deteriorated since then. And how absolutely awful it is to be governed by pip-squeaks."

PETER BURDON in **Coventry Evening Telegraph**, 13th July.

OUR SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT: G.K.'S WEEKLY

LAST month we published an article on the G.K. Chesterton Study Centre and compared and contrasted the views of the two Chestertons, G.K. and our very own A.K. This month we publish as a special supplement a sampler of articles from **G.K.'s Weekly**, the weekly journal founded by Gilbert Chesterton to espouse his Distributist philosophy and policies. It was not a militant paper and G.K.'s articles were not of a kind to cause any trembles of fear in Wall Street or the City of London. Nevertheless, genius bloweth where it listeth. As well as carrying G.K.'s magnificent articles, the journal drew several talented writers into the Distributist cause and gave publicity and practical support to various Distributist ventures. In succeeding issues, we intend publishing a number of articles on the relevance of Distributism today. But for the moment, enjoy the pleasure of reading **G.K.'s Weekly**.

GK's WEEKLY

EDITED BY G.K.
CHESTERTON

A Sampler

Registered as a Newspaper.

SIXPENCE

Telephone No. City 1978.

Offices, 20 & 21, Essex Street, Strand, W.C.

CONTENTS:

THE FIRST PRINCIPLE	3	FOUND WANDERING. By G. K. Chesterton	12
NOTES OF THE WEEK	5	POEM: The World State	13
FROM "G.K.'s WEEKLY" A HUNDRED YEARS AGO	8	PARLIAMENT FROM WITHIN. By Sir Henry Slesser, K.C., M.P. ...	14
WHY WEMBLEY WAS WOBBLY	8	POEM: The Old Gentleman in the Park	15
ANSWERS TO THE POETS:		THE THIEF. By Walter de la Mare	16
The Skylark Replies to Wordsworth	9	THE DRAMA: Spring Cleaning—and Brinsley Sheridan. By J. K.	
The Sea Replies to Byron	9	Prothero	19
DON'T SAY IT	10	REVIEWS:	
POEM: The New Fiction	10	The White Monkey. By F. G. Bettany	20
THE BAG. By H. Belloc	11	Novels of the Day. By Louis J. McQuilland	21
POEM: True Sensibility	12	LIBRARY LIST	25

THE FIRST PRINCIPLE.

THIS single adventure in weekly journalism cannot compete with our wealthy and world-wide press in resources and reports. In the case of Russia our modest distinction is only this; that we are really concerned with the abuses of Bolshevism and not only with the abuse of it. When the Trade Union Report on the experiment in Eastern Europe came out and was considered in the press, the result was very interesting indeed; its very dullness was interesting. We think it highly probable that the Trade Union delegates did not understand the conditions in Russia. But we are sure they understood them a great deal better than their English critics understand the conditions in England. It is all very well to repeat distractedly, "What are we coming to, with all this Bolshevism?" It is as relevant to add, "What are we coming to, even without Bolshevism?" The answer is: Monopoly. It is certainly not "private enterprise." The American Trust is not private enterprise. It would be truer to call the Spanish Inquisition private judgment. Monopoly is neither private nor enterprising. It exists to prevent private enterprise. And that is the present goal of our progress, if there were not a Bolshevik in the world. This paper exists to demand that we fight Bolshevism with something better than plutocracy. But anyhow we must get something better than silence about plutocracy. Com-

pared with these evasions, the Trade Union Report is really a very philosophical document. It suffers of course from the faults of an age of very superficial philosophy. It is amusing to note the rather dazed solemnity with which the writers report the position of Woman in the new Russia. But in the same connection there was another reference that was not superficial but fundamental. In describing the marriage laws, which seem to be chiefly directed against marriage, the writers say that in this general divorce and dissolution it would certainly be hard for anyone to found a great family. That is precisely true and profoundly important. It marks again the narrowness of mere industrialism like our own, that the writer cannot really imagine any rooted family except a great family. But he is right about what made the family great. Aristocracy became powerful, much too powerful, because it did not consist of individuals, but had a name like a nation. Democracy will never become powerful unless every family is a great family. Perhaps it would have been better if the French Revolution had extended and not extinguished heraldry; if all the stormers of the Bastille, having undoubtedly borne arms, had borne armorial bearings. Anyhow, the State will always defeat the individual; if the citizen is to rule he must be more than an individual. But do we want him

to rule? Bolshevism does not; and Bolshevism is not alone in that. It is absolutely certain that democracy will not be democratic unless it is domestic. But the Bolshevist does not want it to be domestic, because he does not want it to be democratic. That is the vital distinction between the two kinds of revolution. The old phrase Home Rule was really applicable to the revolt of a people who believe in homes. It is more doubtful if the *Daily Herald* will ever call itself the *Family Herald*.

The thing behind Bolshevism and many other modern things is a new doubt. It is not merely a doubt about God; it is rather specially a doubt about Man. The old morality, the Christian religion, the Catholic Church, differed from all this new mentality because it really believed in the rights of men. That is, it believed that ordinary men were clothed with powers and privileges and a kind of authority. Thus the ordinary man had a right to deal with dead matter, up to a given point; that is the right of property. Thus the ordinary man had a right to rule the other animals within reason; that is the objection to vegetarianism and many other things. The ordinary man had a right to judge about his own health, and what risks he would take with the ordinary things of his environment; that is the objection to Prohibition and many other things. The ordinary man had a right to judge of his children's health, and generally to bring up children to the best of his ability; that is the objection to many interpretations of modern State education. Now in these primary things in which the old religion trusted a man, the new philosophy utterly distrusts a man. It insists that he must be a very rare sort of man to have any rights in these matters; and when he is the rare sort, he has the right to rule others even more than himself. It is this profound scepticism about the common man that is the common point in the most contradictory elements of modern thought. That is why Mr. Bernard Shaw wants to evolve a new animal that shall live longer and grow wiser than man. That is why Mr. Sidney Webb wants to herd the men that exist like sheep, or animals much more foolish than man. They are not rebelling against an abnormal tyranny; they are rebelling against what they think is a normal tyranny; the tyranny of the normal. They are not in revolt against the king. They are in revolt against the citizen. The old revolutionist, when he stood on the roof (like the revolutionist in *The Dynamiter*) and looked over the city, used to say to himself, "Think how the princes and nobles revel in their palaces; think how the captains and cohorts ride the streets and trample on the people." But the new revolutionist is not brooding on that. He is saying, "Think of all those stupid men in vulgar villas or ignorant slums. Think how badly they teach

their children; think how they do the wrong thing to the dog and offend the feelings of the parrot." In short, these sages, rightly or wrongly, cannot trust the normal man to rule in the home; and most certainly do not want him to rule in the State. They do not really want to give him any political power. They are willing to give him a vote; because they have long discovered that it need not give him any power. They are not willing to give him a house, or a wife, or a child, or a dog, or a cow, or a piece of land; because these things really do give him power.

Now we wish it to be understood at the start that our policy is to give him power by giving him these things. We wish to insist that this is the real moral division underlying all our disputes, and perhaps the only one really worth disputing. We are far from denying, especially at this stage, that there is much to be said on the other side. We would rather insist that nearly everything that is said is said on the other side. We alone, perhaps, are likely to insist in the full sense that the average respectable citizen ought to have something to rule. We alone, to the same extent and for the same reason, have the right to call ourselves democratic. A republic used to be called a nation of kings; and in our republic the kings really have kingdoms. All modern governments, Prussian or Russian, all modern movements, Capitalist or Socialist, are taking away that kingdom from that king. Because they dislike the independence of that kingdom, they are against property. Because they dislike the loyalty of that kingdom, they are against marriage.

In this our first leading article we are most concerned to lay down that proposition; more concerned even than to prove it. That is what we think; and Bolshevism and Capitalism are absolutely at one in thinking the opposite. We shall answer in due course the arguments based on the weakness and vulgarity of the average citizen; we merely point out here that the arguments are based on that and nothing else. Both use the same argument against us; that a human life has now become impossible to humanity. We do not agree; we hold the old mystical dogma, that what a man has done man can do. They hold a rather more mysterious dogma; that man cannot do a thing because he has done it. But anyhow, it is a strange conclusion of the modern scientific advance that it leaves us with a choice between the impossible and the intolerable. For if we cannot go back, it hardly seems worth while to go forward. There is nothing in front but a flat wilderness of standardisation either by Bolshevism or Big Business. And it is strange that we at least have seen sanity, if only in a vision, while they go forward chained eternally to enlargement without liberty and progress without hope.

MRS. MARKHAM'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND

(continued).

TOMMY: You promised, dear Mamma, to tell us about the way in which we were governed.

MAMMA: So I did, my dear, and I will be very happy to do so to-day. You must know then . . .

MARY: Oh, Mamma, you also promised to tell us about kangaroos!

TOMMY (*angrily*): A murrain on you, Mary.

MAMMA (*severely*): How often have I told you, Tommy, not to use the word "murrain." It is exceedingly vulgar! And you, Mary, never dare to interrupt me when I am speaking! Well, then, you must know that we live in England in what we call a Democracy.

TOMMY: Oh, Mamma, how delightful that sounds! Pray what is the meaning of this interesting word?

MAMMA: You do well to ask, my dear Tommy. A Democracy is a kind of government in which everyone governs themselves because they love freedom too much to allow others to govern them. There was once a wicked King called Charles 1st, who tried to govern us instead of letting us govern ourselves, but we cut off his head, and from that moment no-one has dared interfere with us.

MARY: Is that the one of whom there is a statue in Charing Cross, Mamma?

MAMMA: Yes, my dear, it was put up as a warning against anyone doing such a thing again.

TOMMY: Then, Mamma, we can all do what we like—I shall begin to-morrow after breakfast.

MAMMA: No, my dear, this is not true of children, who have to do what they are told. It is only for grown-up people.

MARY: Then when I am grown up I shall make a law that I am to have a large box of chocolates every day.

MAMMA (*smiling indulgently*): I am afraid, Mary, you hardly understand the difficulty we should be in if everybody went on in that way! No; the only way in which people can govern themselves, when there are very many of them, is for them to vote who shall be what is called "their representatives" and make laws for them according to the orders they shall have received from us.

TOMMY (*in tones of horror*): What! like that bald old man with the long white beard who shook hands with Papa at the Flower Show?

MAMMA (*solemnly*): My dear, you must not laugh at Lord Harold Howk, our Member: for though he does not represent our Party in Parliament he is deservedly respected.

MARY (*puzzled*): But, Mamma, if he does not represent us, how can he be our representative?

MAMMA: I will explain. In every part of the country two or even three gentlemen come forward and ask to be made Members of Parliament. Then we vote, and the one who gets most votes is successful and becomes a Member. Thus, though you may vote for one of these three, yet another becomes your Member of Parliament. Indeed, this is often the case.

TOMMY: Thank you, dear Mamma, it is now all perfectly clear. And pray what do these Members of Parliament do when they are chosen?

MAMMA: They go to a place called the House of Commons which is at Westminster and very beautifully decorated, and then some of them say "I was sent here

to make such and such a law" and others say "Well, I was sent to make a different law."

TOMMY: Well, then, if they cannot agree there is nothing left I suppose but to fight it out.

MAMMA: Why that does indeed happen in less advanced Nations: but we have a better way. The Members do not fight but *vote*, and whichever proposal gets the most votes is successful . . .

MARY: What! Again?

MAMMA (*continuing*): . . . and is ready to become a law. You will see what a good way this is, for it means that nothing is ever done in England if only a few people want it. Nothing is done unless most people want it, and that is why we are all so happy and contented, unlike a pack of quarrelling foreigners. Then it goes to some people called Lords, who look at it.

TOMMY: Yes, Mamma, you were kind enough to tell us all about these Lords long ago.

MAMMA (*continuing*): And then it is signed by the King and becomes a true law at last, which we are all happy to obey.

TOMMY: Can you give us an example, Mamma, of some laws made like this?

MAMMA (*cheerfully*): Indeed I can, my dear. There is a law which prevents working men from drinking before mid-day or in the middle of the afternoon, or after ten o'clock at night: and there is another law saying that if a man is working very hard he must pay a quarter or a third of what he earns and give it to the bankers and certain other rich men. If these laws had been made by outsiders we should be very angry, no doubt, but as we know that they have been made by ourselves we are quite pleased with them. You see first all the people talked about it thoroughly for a long time. Some were for preventing poor people drinking at all.

MARY: Would not that have been a very good thing, Mamma?

MAMMA: Well, my dear, I think so, but we must bow to the majority. Now after we had all discussed it for a long time, we sent our Members of Parliament to vote in favour of these hours, which shows that most of the English people wanted them. Even the people who make the beer obeyed the law because they knew that the English people wanted it.

TOMMY: That was indeed noble of them, Mamma!

MAMMA: Yes, my dear, you would not have found this self-sacrifice in any other country. But note what followed! It turned out that people drank more than ever, and so these good men became much richer; and that shows us that a good deed is never thrown away.

MARY (*anxiously*): And was it the same about people having to pay that money, Mamma?

MAMMA: Yes, my dear, just the same. We all talked it over a great deal together. Some were for taking away all the money everybody had, others for taking more, and others again less, and then we all voted and it turned out that what we wanted was for people to have about a quarter or a third taken away and given to the bankers.

TOMMY: Were not the bankers very pleased, Mamma, when this law was made?

MAMMA: Yes, my dear, and in their gratitude they put

up very fine buildings all over London, some of which are still in process of erection; and they would have done more had it not been for the wicked working men, who will not put up buildings for more than eight hours at a time and even then quite slowly.

MARY: Thank you, dear Mamma, for telling us all this. I was so interested I quite forgot about kangaroos.

TOMMY: Next time, dear Mamma, will you not talk to us about lawyers and policemen? It must be a most fascinating subject!

MAMMA: Certainly, my dear Tommy; we will talk about these people next time, and I will show you how it is that they have become so good and kind, and why everybody is so fond of them.

H. BELLOC.

G.K.'s WEEKLY. NEXT WEEK

DRIFT - - By HILAIRE BELLOC

THE MEDIÆVAL CARPENTER

By LI. E. WILLIAMS, A.R.I.B.A.

THE CASE OF ADAM SMITH

By G. K. CHESTERTON

Order from Newsagents: or write to
The Manager, G.K.'s Weekly,
2, Little Essex Street, Strand, W.C.2.

How Much Progress?

BY CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS

THE rulers of most men's minds are not facts nor statistics but general impressions, and, like other rulers, general impressions are only with the greatest difficulty deposed. The tenth birthday of *G.K.'s Weekly* is an occasion appropriate for the asking of the question, What is the general impression in the public mind that is the most powerful obstacle to the spread of the ideas of the paper?

I think that there is no doubt of the answer.

It is not difficult to get people to agree that there are many disadvantages in the noise, the rush, the complexity of modern life, nor to agree that in modern society there is still much miserable poverty which must be eliminated in the future. Yet, thinks the modern man, for all that, there is no doubt that things are much better than they were. If the noise and the rush and the complexity are prices to be paid, yet they are prices that we have paid for solid advantages, and, if there is still poverty, at least there is much less poverty than there used to be. What survives survives as a relic of an evil past.

Such is a perfectly respectable and intelligible position. It is the position occupied by the vast majority of those who have not studied the facts. It seems to be confirmed by the old among us who can tell perfectly truthful tales of the condition of the poor as they remember it in their young days. But what are the facts?

The extraordinarily interesting and important articles concerning mediæval conditions which appeared recently in *G.K.'s Weekly* from the pen of Mr. Featherstone Hammond must surely have raised doubts in any minds in which they were not already present concerning this easy progressive theory of history, nor are the facts really at all doubtful. In the 1870's the Professorship of Political Economy at Oxford was held by Thorold Rogers. Thorold Rogers occupied his time in going round the country and collecting exhaustive statistics of the prices and wages current at the various places in England and at the various dates in English history. The results of his inquiries are available to the world in his monumental *History of Agriculture and Prices and Six Centuries of Work and Wages*.

Suppose, said Rogers, that a labourer's family requires for its year's provision three quarters of wheat, three of malt and two of oatmeal. Let us take the wages current and the prices current at the various dates in English history and see how many weeks' work it would take him to earn that supply. He starts off in 1495, when the agricultural labourer's wage was 2/- a week. He gives all the prices—you can find the calculation in his *History of Work and Wages*—and he concludes that the labourer could earn the supply by 15 weeks' work. By 1564 wages had risen to 3/6 a week, but prices had risen a great deal more. He could only earn his supply then by 40 weeks' work. By 1610 prices had risen still further, and the labourer's whole year's labour would have been insufficient to earn him his supply by 24/9½.

In 1651 things are a little better and he could earn it by 40 weeks' work. In 1684 they are worse again, and his whole year's labour would have been just insufficient to earn him the supply. By 1725, when earnings were from £13 to £15 a year and the cost of the supply £16 2s. 3d., they would have been plainly insufficient. In 1866, the date at which Rogers was carrying out his investigations, the agricultural labourer's wage was 13/- a week. In Henry VII's time it had been, as we have said, 2/-. Between the two dates prices had multiplied by 12. Therefore in terms of real goods the agricultural labourer of Queen Victoria's time got about half what the labourer of Henry VII's time got. A worker in the building trade in Henry VII's time got 3/4, which, multiplied by 12 makes 40/-; in Thorold Rogers' time he got 42/9, but, whereas rent was one of the heaviest items in the budget of Thorold Rogers' builder, it was a negligible factor in that of Henry VII's or of any poor man before the Statute of Frauds of Charles II's reign. Therefore, so far from seeing there a record of steady improvement, Rogers' summary of English history was 'I contend that from 1563 to 1824 a conspiracy, concocted by the law and carried out by parties interested in its success, was entered into to cheat the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the soil, to deprive him of hope and to degrade him into irremediable poverty. . . For more than two centuries

and a half, the English law and those who administered the law were engaged in grinding the English

workman down to the lowest pittance, in stamping out every expression or act which indicated any organised discontent and in multiplying penalties on him when he thought of his natural rights.'

If then there has been improvement since the middle of the nineteenth century, the reason is not that improvement is the natural law of society but rather that there was so enormous a room for improvement precisely because there had been no improvement at all for the previous three hundred years. Now what are the facts for the years since Thorold Rogers? Statistics are abundant. Perhaps the most easily available are those in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* under the articles Wages and Prices.

Anyone who looks up those statistics can see that through the 1850's there were indeed oscillations both in wages and in prices but that they were such as to leave the condition of the working man just about the same as it had been before. With the 1860's a definite and steady, though perhaps slow, improvement sets in and continues up to the end of the century. Wages in 1858 were 55 to 1913's 100. Wholesale prices were 109 to 1913's 100. By 1899 prices were down to 80 and wages up to 90—a very considerable improvement. But,—and here is the vital point of which no one must be allowed to remain in ignorance,—between 1899 and 1914, between the Boer War and the European War, there was no further improvement. Indeed things slipped back somewhat. Prices rose from 80 to 100 while wages only rose from 90 to 100. It is a truism that the old financial system is to-day in ruins, but it is often said that it was the

war that smashed it. It is not so. The war was the result of the fact that the system was already breaking down.

I have said nothing in this article of the reasons why wages rose when they rose and fell when they fell, for I want to concentrate the reader's attention on the facts without for the moment distracting it with the reasons for the facts. For it is important to understand the facts in order not to fall a victim to a psychological trick. 'The true test of a civilisation,' said Dr. Johnson, 'is a decent provision for the poor.' On that test it is clear that, during the four hundred years since Progress began, there have been only forty during which things have been getting better. The general rule has been that things have been getting worse. But it so happens that those forty years were the years in which those to whom we rightly look up as persons of experience were growing to manhood. There is thus a great danger that the last forty years of the nineteenth century, which were in fact a highly abnormal period, will be looked on as a normal period and that we shall slip into thinking that all the past was like that—which it wasn't.

A Metrical Psalm

By C. E. Baines

When God smites Sodom once again,
No useless fires shall fall;
No fumes of brimstone spread in vain
Their ineffective pall.
This time His anger shall a more
Conclusive sentence pass:
The Dead Sea shall not whelm her o'er
But a living sea of grass.

Then shall that be that was foretold:
For in these streets of green
Our cattle shall bear fiftyfold
O'er mouldering shames unseen:
Unseen, and long forgot; save where
Some mattock masterful
Shall lay a usurer's carcass bare
Or split a pervert's skull.

But we, delivered from the den
That housed their stricken seed—
Where barren were the lusts of men
And only gold could breed—
For freedom armed—for service shod
Shall stand that men may see
(After how many years!) what God
Meant Englishmen to be.

As in the Temple's inner shrine
The polished corners glow,
Shall be the daughters of our line:
Our sons like saplings grow,
Shall grow like timber tall and straight,
Stronger than strength of kings,
And speak to foemen at the gate
Unanswerable things.

Surely in those green streets of ours
Shall no complaining be,
No homage to unholy Powers
And no captivity.
And, surely, hushed will be our boasts
When at His throne we bow—
The dread Almighty Lord of Hosts,
The God who speeds the Plough!

The Restoration of Property

On May 26, Mr. Hilaire Belloc addressed a meeting of the Distributist League (Central Branch) at Carr's Restaurant, Strand, W.C.2, on "The Restoration of Property." We quote the following extracts from his speech:—

"THE difficulties before us in the restoration of property are twofold. They are, first of all the philosophy under which the modern world, particularly in this country, has been created and has lived increasingly during the last 300 years; and secondly, the actual state of society produced by that philosophy. I distinguish between the two. A philosophy—or a religion, which is the only practical form of any philosophy—is a state of mind, a mood, an attitude towards the universe, and in the long run that produces its fruit in institutions, examples of action, of manner, of little daily details which flow from the philosophy. But you must distinguish between the two, because the first is not easily approachable in the same way in which the second is approachable.

"Let us take things in their logical order. There is a certain philosophy called natural religion we all have in us, and under which we should all live were we free of tradition (which of course is impossible to man) or had we nothing but an unpolluted tradition; and it must be justly taken that under those conditions property exists, in the sense, that is, of property well divided. One can imagine no more normal human society, no society more normal to man as we know him, as he is. A society in which men live in security, such that every production of wealth with that which they possess maintains them in the community, and can be handed on to their posterity. That is normal to man. All our folk lore, all our fairy tales, morals, proverbs, point to that as being our norm. If I steal my neighbour's watch I am not punished—a poor man would be punished, but I should not be—I am blamed on the theory that it is property which I am infringing. We all think normally, in our human consciences, in terms of property. That, I say, is a fundamental which we must all admit.

"Of course a man naturally owns, and naturally will have the tradition and security that goes with ownership, but to that philosophy was added another philosophy which came in slowly over the Græco-Roman world, and happily got through to our world, called the conversion of the Roman Empire. There was a slow transmogrification from the old Pagan religion into a more conscious, more active and more dangerous, but perhaps more developed state of mind, which was called Christendom, and under that again property was established, and in a very interesting way; because the Christian religion, having baptised the Græco-Roman world, had such an effect upon it that slowly and inevitably the slave became an owner. By very slow degrees it happened, and before the end of the Middle Ages, throughout the west of Christendom, on the whole and taking it by and large, there had been a commonwealth established in which most men owned and most men could transmit what they owned to their posterity. There was the guild for the craftsman and the village community for the peasant.

That was the norm of that society, and men were pretty happy under that society, and the test of normality is whether people are happy or not. If you doubt whether they were happy or not, go to the places which they carved, and see the songs which they sang, and compare them with the songs which we sing. As for carving, well go and look at the carving.

"Now that philosophy was warped by a great revolution which began after the Black Death, and was growing in the early 16th century; but after a tremendous fight, by the middle of the 17th century, Europe had decided to divide into two camps from exhaustion. The old tradition could not conquer the new revolt, and the new revolt could not conquer the old religion. One of the camps said, 'I have done with all the old things, I have got some new principles altogether,' and the other said, 'No, I am going on,' but did not only say it was going on, but organised itself for resistance lest it should be swamped; and those two camps in Europe went on. You will remember that in those days the Greek Orthodox Church hardly counted.

"Now under those two philosophies, the first philosophy, the rebellious philosophy, won. The general term for it is Protestant, but it was much more, it was also the general emancipation from the clerical system of the Middle Ages spread out in all sorts of ways. There is no generic term for it, but it won, and having won it produced very slowly, by stages of which many are familiar, after generations, what is known as the Capitalist System, in which efficiency was produced not by the supervision of work or by the guild, but by competition; in which the peasant, because he was the less instructed, was destroyed under competition; in which, not exactly because men worshipped Mammon but because they worshipped the competitive idea, the rich man ate up the small man until we arrived at the state of affairs where we are now, called Industrial Capitalism. . . .

"Now let us proceed to the second point, which is part of the first. I say this philosophy has produced Industrial Capitalism. What do we mean by that? Not the use of certain machines, because they might just as well be held by a guild as by an individual. What we mean essentially is plutocracy. We mean that the mass of men have lost their security and their choice of how they shall live within the limits wherein men should normally have such choice. So that I cannot to-day, and Mr. Chesterton cannot to-day, write what we think, as we would have done in the 17th century or even in the 18th, without the agreement of a few vulgarians who happen to have the money.

"Our second point is that this philosophy has produced a certain state of society. The change in philosophy is our root difficulty, but the second is that it has produced a certain state of society. It is a state in which by far the greater part of men are attuned to being wage slaves, that is, a state of society in which a man is more afraid of losing his job than of anything else. It is that which controls us all. Of course the mass of the people who are really poor are entirely wage slaves. They have withdrawn themselves from the worst of the conditions by a

certain amount of organisation, but still, that is the norm of our society; and the great struggle among the few who are free from this condition is to avoid being a wage slave, and the greatest misfortune is to die a wage slave. But we are all attuned to that state of mind in this country. Think for instance of the extraordinary phrase 'Unemployment.' The Rothschilds, if there are any left, are unemployed. It is not having nothing to do which is the disaster, it is not getting money for doing things. The disaster is in not having security. . . .

"We have had during the last fifty or sixty years inventions and discoveries, such as the internal combustion engine and the distribution of electric power, which might have aided enormously the distribution of property if our philosophy had been right. But more important in my judgment is this. Industrial Capitalism has broken down. It has broken down for a very simple arithmetical reason—it distributes less purchasing power than it creates. I am not going to speak of Major Douglas's scheme of Social Credit, because that is merely an indirect method of distributing property, which I prefer to achieve by direct means. Industrial Capitalism has broken down, not because it is tired or old or wicked, but because it is producing an amount of wealth greater than it is distributing purchasing power for that wealth; and to put it very crudely indeed, if I want to make a hundred thousand boots, or rather employ men to make those boots, by the time the boots are made I have distributed to the men who make them the money wherewith to purchase thirty thousand boots, and what am I to do with the seventy thousand boots left? I must sell them to niggers, or to the Colonies, if you prefer that term. And supposing they also learn to turn a handle, and produce the boots themselves, where are you? That is why Industrial Capitalism has broken down.

"One of the results is that people are getting disgusted and saying something must be done. We cannot tell people what to do in a cut and dried system. No man attempting the restoration of property, or Distributism as it is sometimes called, can say, 'Here is my cut and dried plan.' You cannot do it, because it is normal to man, organic; it is not mechanical, it is not theoretical. What we can do is to advance something on the way, to propagate the idea, to propagate its results, to insist upon it here and there, in this reform and that, by blocking this abuse and that, until there shall be established in society a certain growth which will lead ultimately towards better distribution of property. We do not want, and it would be folly to attempt, and it is not human to regard, and it is futile to desire the equal distribution of property. If you have a society in which the norm, it may not even be the majority, but the determining number of men are possessed of security in what they do, producing with their personality and with their production fully secured for the future, you have established a healthy state, you have reconstructed property; and if you will consider that, doing it organically, without revolution, you may, in spite of the enormous obstacles in front of you, do the trick. That is the rule I put before myself, and which, if I could come back to life after my death, I should probably find completely ruined."

If you think any article in this issue of **G.K.'s WEEKLY** will be of interest to any friend or acquaintance, send us a postcard to that effect and we shall be pleased to send a marked copy to the address you give.

State your friend's address and your own and mention the title of the article. Write to:

**The Manager, G.K.'s Weekly,
2, Little Essex St., W.C.2.**

League Meetings

CENTRAL BRANCH

The activities of the Central Branch will continue through the Summer. Members of the Branch, and non-members are invited to a Social Evening on June 16. Details of arrangements will be published next week. The Central Branch Committee is now engaged upon the compilation of a Speakers' Handbook, notes and suggestions for which will be welcomed. Members interested may attend a meeting of the Committee at the Devereux, June 9, from 7.30 p.m. It is hoped to hold a public meeting on Credit Unions, addressed by Mr. Roy F. Bergengren, the American organiser, at the end of the month. All London Distributists are asked to co-operate actively in the work of the Branch.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH.

Meetings at Bellman Buildings, 39, Carr's Lane, Birmingham, at 7.30 p.m.

June 9. Delegates will report on the Glossop Conference of The League.

June 23. Mr. J. F. Galleymore on "Hitler in the Rhineland."

July 7. Miss N. Careless on "The Reconstruction of Property."

July 21. Subject and Speaker to be announced later.

CLYDESDALE BRANCH.

The Branch holds its meetings in the Queen Anne Restaurant, Argyle Street, Glasgow, every Wednesday, at 7.30, where new members can be enrolled.

BRADFORD BRANCH.

The discussion following Mr. E. Wilson's paper on "Co-partnership" was so animated that it was decided to continue it at our next meeting, to be held on Monday, June 12, at St. Cuthbert's Guild Rooms, Wilmer Road, Heaton, at 7.30 p.m. Mr. M. White will open the discussion with a short paper on "Why Distributists should not support Co-partnership." Branch members are invited to bring their friends.

SOUTHAMPTON BRANCH.

Meetings are held every fortnight at 123, Warren Avenue. Write to the Secretary for particulars.

GLASGOW BRANCH.

Meetings will be held in the Highlander's Institute, Elmbank Street, at 7.45 p.m., on the following Mondays:—

June 19. Mr. McGlinchey—"Lithuania."

July 3. Discussion on "National Self-Sufficiency."

Hon. Sec., J. J. Lynch, 122, Quarrybrae Street, Parkhead, Glasgow, E.I.

BOURNEMOUTH BRANCH.

Readers of **G.K.'s Weekly** living at or near Bournemouth who are interested in the work of the Distributist League are invited to write to Mr. R. H. McCausland, 43, St. Luke's Road, Bournemouth, with a view to increasing membership of the Branch and planning future activities.

NEW SCOTTISH BRANCH.

The new Branch holds its meetings in the Queen Anne Restaurant, Argyle Street, Glasgow, every Wednesday at 7.30, where new members are being enrolled. Secretary: Mr. J. MacNamee, 513, Alexandra Parade, Glasgow.

The Problem of Machinery

By C. T. B. D.

A study of importance from a Distributist's point of view

PRICE 6d.

The Distributist League

2, Little Essex Street, London, W.C.2.

THE DISTRIBUTIST LEAGUE

Below is re-printed a list of books, some directly concerned with Distributist policy, some of general interest to Distributists. They may be ordered from the offices of the League.

Two of our own publications explain briefly why the League was formed, what it is doing and plans to do, and why it feels entitled to ask for your support.

WHAT DISTRIBUTISM MEANS

By J. Desmond Gleeson
2d. net.

In this pamphlet Mr. Gleeson sums up the circumstances that made necessary the Distributist campaign for the restoration of liberty by the encouragement of small ownership and the defence of the family. If you are a member of the League already, give copies to your friends and thus persuade them to become members. If you are not a member, "What Distributism Means" will make you one.

THE DISTRIBUTIST PROGRAMME

1s. net.

A statement of practical policies by the introduction of which large scale capitalism and its twin brother Communism could be replaced by a Distributist State.

Order "What Distributism Means" and "The Distributist Programme" from The Distributist League, 7/8, Rolls Passage, London, E.C.4.

BOOKS TO READ

Two books everyone must read:—

- The Outline of Sanity. G. K. Chesterton. 3s. 6d.
The Servile State. Hilaire Belloc. 4s. 6d.

Some League Publications.

- The Distributist Programme. 1s.
What Distributism Means. J. D. Gleeson. 2d.
The Problem of Machinery. 6d.
Some Arguments for the Dedistribution of Property. 8d.
The Drink Problem. H. S. D. Went. 1d.
War on the Weak. K. L. Kenrick. 2d.

On Land Settlement.

- Flee to the Fields. A Symposium with Introduction by Hilaire Belloc. 5s.
Town to Country. G. C. Heseltine. 1s. 6d.
New Maryland. Rev. Vincent Baker. 1s.

On Agriculture.

- The Agricultural Problem. F. N. Blundell. 6d.

William Cobbett.

- Rural Rides. 2 vols. 4s.
Cottage Economy. 1s. 6d.
Advice to Young Men. 1s. 6d.
Progress of a Ploughboy.

On Economics.

- Analysis of Usury. Jeffrey Mark. 6s.
The Two Nations. Christopher Hollis. 10s. 6d.
The Defeat of Debt. R. McNair Wilson. 6s.
Young Man's Money. R. McNair Wilson. 3s. 6d.
Promise to Pay. R. McNair Wilson. 3s. 6d.
Monarchy or Money Power. R. McNair Wilson. 3s. 6d.
Economics in the Middle Ages. C. Featherstone Hammond. 1s.
The Breakdown of Money. Christopher Hollis. 4s. 6d.

Miscellaneous.

- Francis Thompson and Other Essays. Vincent McNabb, O.P. 5s.
The Well and the Shallows. G. K. Chesterton. 7s. 6d.
The Devil's Devices. H. D. C. Pepler. 5s.
G.K.'s Miscellany. 7s. 6d.

Send your order with remittance to the Distributist League and the books will be despatched promptly.

THE DISTRIBUTIST LEAGUE,
7/8, Rolls Passage, London, E.C.4.

THE SCOTTISH DISTRIBUTIST LEAGUE,
50, St. George's Road, Charing Cross, Glasgow.

THE DAY OF THE VIGILANTE

NOEL HUNT examines the consequences of legislative leniency

PRESS reports tell us that the Director of Public Prosecutions has admitted that "the recent spate of vigilante attacks is the result of a collapse of faith in our judicial system". She is quite right. Various measures are planned "aimed at restoring confidence". None of these will do anything to reduce the incidence of vigilante action, and for a very simple reason: they are misdirected, designed to give the impression that vigorous action is under way, while in fact doing nothing.

The real reason for vigilante action by an outraged public is that they see criminals whom they feel deserve severe punishment escaping with derisory penalties. In today's "caring society" there are no criminals to be punished; there are only "offenders" to be "understood" and "rehabilitated". Never must they be punished - the word horrifies the penologist - but they must be "treated"; and if possible the law which they broke should be repealed: it is clearly repressive, or it would not be broken. Under such circumstances vigilantism is inevitable. The views of the penologists and other "ologists" effectively prevent any other viewpoint being voiced. Yet the public continues stubbornly to believe that criminals are villains, not victims; and that they should be punished, not rehabilitated. Until we make crime a high-risk occupation the risk of vigilante action will remain.

To bring this about it is essential that most of the civil service establishment responsible for lawlessness and disorder be retired at once and replaced by old-fashioned disciplinarians - "hangers and floggers" as the liberal media love to call them. At the same time, some of the wetter and more socially conscious of the judiciary should be urgently invited to go. Their places should also be taken by disciplinarians.

Rough Justice

In all countries and in all societies the vigilante will appear when the public see villains escaping their just deserts. For the same reason there will be complaints of "police brutality" and of the police dealing out rough justice to criminals whom they know to be guilty, but whom they also know will be given derisory sentences by a "caring" judiciary. The police say, rightly, that guilty villains should be punished, and severely. If the courts lack the resolution to do this, then the police will be tempted to resort to "brutality". This may be deplorable, but it is the way people are. To eliminate it, let the courts ensure that convicted criminals rue the day they transgressed.

A perfect example of what happens when the public lose confidence in the law is the recent case of two men and a schoolboy who kidnapped and tortured the school bully. They took this action because the bully suffered no punishment or even censure for his actions. What they did may be regrettable, but it is certain that there will be no bullying at that particular school for some time to come. Moralising is pointless: reward bullying with physical pain and it will stop. But not otherwise. When two teen-aged girls were accused of murdering an elderly spinster, a mob drove their families off the estate. The police said, speaking no doubt as ordered, "We know that feelings are running very high, but it is up to the courts to see that justice is

done, not individuals." Precisely. And precisely because the public no longer believe that the courts will see that justice is done, an angry crowd took the law into its own hands. However much the trendsetters may deplore what happened, we may be sure that it will be some time before an elderly person is molested on that estate again. We may be sure, too, that many on the estate bless the vigilantes for their deed.

Again, we read of a 14-year-old boy who has been arrested 28 times, and has escaped custody each time. Sooner or later a mob will deal with this little pest and the many others like him. It will happen because the man in the street does not believe that justice is being done. The great and the good will be horrified. Yet it is their half-baked notions, translated into law, which make it impossible for society to deal with these dregs. The boy's father is reported as saying: "He is totally wild and he's only 14, for God's sake" - as if this excused and explained everything. This sorry travesty of a father apparently feels no guilt, nor does he feel that he has been a failure as a parent. It is not explained why he was not made to sign a recognisance as surety for his son's behaviour, and why he has not been reduced to bankruptcy by the child's unruly behaviour. A lack of judicial courage and a bench advised by social scientists and "ologists", probably.

Age Of The Alibi

We live in the Age of the Alibi, when nobody is ever responsible for anything; when everything is condoned or explained away except fascism and "war crimes". But if the state will not compel its judiciary to set about criminals as they deserve, then we shall see more and more vigilante mobs. How truly the proverb tells us that "all goes when courage goes". Writing centuries ago, that great Roman Seneca rightly observed: "It is not right to show general clemency; and to forgive everyone is as much cruelty as to forgive no one." Just so. It is pointless to complain of vigilante action so long as spineless politicians allow those whom the people regard as criminals to be pampered. The point about vigilantism is that, like gunboat diplomacy, it works. The justice may be rough, and the methods messy, but it does make for public order.

In his book **Social Contract**, Robert Ardrey elegantly sets out the state of affairs in Britain and America today. He tells us of the inevitable results of a lack of resolution in the governing classes: "As a people normally gets the government it deserves, so a society normally receives the punishments it asks for. And as long as we support the Age of the Alibi, just so long must we inhabit the Age of Anxiety. There must come a time, of course, when the social order, to endure, accepts violent means to subdue violent disorder. And we shall then see an endless procession of concentration camps, death penalties, public whippings and police ascendancy." We have been warned. The state of affairs in the West today precisely bears out Ardrey's predictions.

If we wish to see the end of the vigilante, then we must insist that a criminal gets his just deserts, as seen by the man in the street, not by the social scientist. If we cannot bring this change about, then we shall see more and more vicious vigilante mobs dealing rough and even rougher justice, sometimes to the wrong people. What is more, we shall deserve what we shall certainly get.

Candour needs more subscribers! Have YOU secured one yet?

WHY THE DANES SAID "NO"

AS a Danish reader of your newspaper may I comment on why Denmark voted "No" to the Maastricht Treaty in the recent referendum? The answer lies in the eight questions that the Danes put to themselves before the referendum:

Who wants a European union? Is it the well-paid officials, commissioners and politicians that live off the E.C., forcing a development for which the time isn't ripe, nor has popular support? Or is it a deep felt wish among the population? Denmark thinks it is the former.

Is it sensible to cede yet more power and yet more decision-making to a distant city in a country whose language we don't even speak? Or should decision-making take place among the population in the language they speak? Denmark thinks it is the latter. Is it democratic to give yet more power to the E.C. Commission, which we have never had the opportunity to vote for or reject? Or should decision-making continue as now, to rest in institutions which are chosen direct by citizens in free, democratic elections? Denmark thinks it is the latter.

Is it wise to push the U.S.A. out of Europe, which common E.C. foreign and defence policies risk doing? Or should Europe remain allied with the U.S.A. instead of competing as a new, inflated super-power? Denmark thinks it is the latter. Is it reasonable that the most well-off countries of Europe concentrate their efforts to strengthen their integration, while the new democracies in Eastern Europe in need of attention must instead face tougher conditions before coming into the warm? Or should European collaboration rather be about uniting the whole of Europe to secure stability, and not to exclude others? Denmark thinks it is the latter.

Is it reasonable to try to bind the strong and healthy German Mark in the strait-jacket of a central bank with twelve quarrelling members and replace it with a hybrid such as the Ecu? Or should one let the German Mark continue as a healthy, free currency, which is only issued by its rightful owners? Denmark thinks the latter. Is there a trend toward similarities between the E.C. Commission and the politburos we have just got rid of in Eastern Europe, which concentrated power without any democratic foundation, and an unnecessarily overbearing bureaucratic control of everything? Or should one avoid centralised bureaucracy remote from the citizens? Denmark thinks it is the latter.

Why cannot we retain our passports, coinage, ballot system and border controls? Are the E.C. passport, the Ecu currency and open border controls really necessary to further European collaboration? Or does it function quite well as it is? Denmark thinks it is the latter.

HOLGAR BECH PEDERSEN in Dundee Courier, July 11th.

Read the Special National Independence Number of CHOICE, edited by Lady Birdwood, for the truth about the alien forces driving us into a European Super State. Send an s.a.e. to 31 Eastvale, Acton Vale, London W3 7RU. Available in French, German and Italian.

Read COMMON MARKET SUICIDE by A.K. Chesterton. Available from Candour Publishing Company for £1 including postage.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

MADAM - In your April issue I read a report by Maciej Giertych to which I should like to add some comments. Nowadays in Poland we experience degeneration and deterioration in the sphere of the soul of men. Our mass media are imprinting on the minds of Polish youth the notions that homosexuality, pornography, multi-racialism, the E.C., "rap music", Benetton clothes and drug taking represent normality. They want a mindless mass lacking national and racial consciousness, cultural taste and any trace of sanity. Brainwashing Western magazines are translated into Polish and sold here. In almost all towns, owing to district satellite T.V. systems, millions can watch M.T.V. with its jungle "music" and adverts ridiculing everything that is natural. What Mr Giertych called "such Western blessings" are the means by which the New World Order will be imprinted on the minds of Polish youngsters before they are old enough to think for themselves. - D.K., Lublin, Poland.

THE U.D.A. - WHITEHALL'S UNEVEN-HAND

THE Protestant para-military Ulster Defence Association has been banned for failing sufficiently to disguise its links with killing and extortion. The question plaguing the Loyalist community must be this: why is the U.D.A. now declared illegal while Sinn Fein - the mouthpiece of the I.R.A. - continues to propagate its message publicly? Government claims that Sinn Fein is "not actively involved in paramilitary activity" are hogwash. As **The Times** observed, when an I.R.A. member wants to retire from active service, "he can move across the invisible divide into Sinn Fein and stand for the local council. Similarly, a young Sinn Fein activist may disappear overnight to get bloodied at the front line." The separation is no more real than that between many of Robert Maxwell's businesses: it is largely a matter of clever book-keeping. Realistic Loyalists see the U.D.A. ban as a tacit acknowledgement by Whitehall that one day it may end up talking to Sinn Fein. Perhaps they will also realise that they and the British Government are not on the same side in wanting Northern Ireland to remain part of the U.K.

VIOLENCE NOW A "WAY OF LIFE" IN THE NEW SOUTH AFRICA

ACCORDING to the **Cape Times** of July 11th, police told a conference of senior media representatives in Pretoria that violence has become a "way of life" in the country, with the number of people killed showing signs of reaching record highs this year. Instead of staging gimmicky "minutes of silence" at Springbok rugby matches for the "victims of political violence" (which usually arises when the A.N.C. and Inkatha slit each other's throats), it is high time de Klerk's Government ordered a national day of mourning for the hundreds of elderly White men and women who have been brutally murdered in their own flats, houses and on farms. It should also include the policemen butchered while carrying out their duties in the so-called townships.

Read **SPEARHEAD**. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy 90p from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES: U.K. £10 OVERSEAS £12 U.S. \$25 AIRMAIL

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD [Editor: Rosine de Bouneville]